

# Baconiana.

VOL. VI.—*New Series.*

APRIL, 1899.

No. 26.

## BACON'S "ESSAY OF LOVE."

READING lately a pamphlet, entitled, "Bacon or Shakespeare," by Miss E. Marriott, I came across the following passage:—"In the second volume (p. 424) of the delightful biography which his (Lord Tennyson's) son has given us, it appears that someone had written to ask if he thought that Bacon wrote the Plays, and he says:—

"I felt inclined to write back, "Sir, don't be a fool." The way in which Bacon speaks of love is enough to prove that he is not Shakespeare: "I know not how, but martial men are given to love. I think it is but as they are given to wine for perils like to be paid with pleasure." How can a man with such an idea of love have written *Romeo and Juliet*?"

"The passage Tennyson quotes occurs in the brief No. X. of the Essays and throughout is the literary antipodes to Shakespeare's idea, and ideals of love."

As this passage from the life of Tennyson is not unfrequently quoted against Baconians, it will not be unprofitable to enquire whether Bacon's views are quite at variance with those expressed by Shakespeare. It must be remembered that in this passage (which first appears in the Edition of 1,625), Bacon is speaking of the love to which "Martial men" are usually addicted, which can hardly be supposed to have much in common with the pure and ecstatic passion which constitutes the argument of *Romeo and Juliet*. Turning to Shakespeare we find the very same characteristics attributed to martial men.

"But we are soldiers,

And may that soldier, a mere recreant prove,  
That means not, hath not, or is not in love."

—*Troilus and Cressida*, I. iii. 286.

"Sometimes she driveth o'er a soldier's neck,  
And then he dreams of cutting foreign throats,  
Of breaches, ambuscadoes, Spanish blades,  
Of healths five-fathom deep."

—*Romeo and Juliet*, I. iv. 25.

So that in this case instead of the Essay being "the literary antipodes to Shakespeare's idea" we find Bacon and Shakespeare expressing exactly the same opinion, namely, that martial men are given to love and wine.

The argument that because a writer on a given occasion treats a subject in a certain way, he can treat it in no other, is, even if it be applicable in any case, wholly futile when dealing with Bacon, who was endowed perhaps more largely than any other English author with the gift of versatility of style. As this fact is not generally recognised and we are not unfrequently assured by people who judge of Bacon's style merely from the terse and epigrammatic writing employed in the earlier Essays, that the Plays could not have been written by the author of the Essays; I take the liberty to quote from Dr. Abbott's remarks on Bacon as a writer.\* It should be borne in mind that Dr. Abbott is a careful and thoroughly competent critic, whose work has done much towards giving us a true insight into Bacon's character, both as a man and an author.

"Remarking on the difference in style between the earlier and later Editions of the Essays, Lord Macaulay has been led to the conclusion that in the works of Bacon, as in those of Burke, terseness in youth gives place to rich copiousness in old age—a reversal of the natural order of rhetorical development, and this opinion has been so generally adopted without question that a refutation of it may not be without use.

"I do not believe that Lord Macaulay would have come to this conclusion if he had had before him that complete collection of Bacon's works, for which these and later times will remain deeply indebted to Mr. Spedding. Bacon's style varied almost as much as his handwriting; but it was influenced more by the subject matter than by youth or old age. Few men have shewn equal versatility in adapting their language to the slightest shade of circumstance and purpose. His style depended whether he was addressing a king, or a great nobleman, or a philosopher, or a friend; whether he was composing a State paper, pleading in a State trial, magnifying the prerogative, extolling truth, discussing studies, exhorting a judge, sending a New Year's present, or sounding a trumpet to prepare the way for the kingdom of man over nature. It is a mistake to suppose that Bacon was never florid till he grew old. On the contrary, in the early *Devices*, written

\*"Francis Bacon," an account of his life and works by E. A. Abbott, D.D., pp. 447, et seq. Macmillan, 1885.



during his connexion with Essex, he uses a rich exuberant style and poetic rhythm ; but he prefers the rhetorical question of appeal to the complex period.

On the other hand in all his formal philosophical works, even in the *Advancement of Learning*, published as early as 1,605, he uses the graver periodic structure, though often illustrated with rich metaphor. The Essays, both early and late, abound in pithy metaphor, as their natural illustration ; but in the later and weightier edition in which they were enlarged, not only in number, but also "in *weight* so that they are indeed a new work"—there is an intentional increase in rhetorical ornament and illustration, and in some of the later Essays on more serious subjects, there is somewhat more of the periodic structure, but this is caused by the weight of the subject not by weight of years. As instances, take first the following specimens of the early florid style (a comparison between the servant of Love and the servant of Self-love) from the *Device of Essex*, 1594—5 :—

"But give ear now to the comparison of my Master's condition, and acknowledge such a difference as betwixt the melting hailstone and the solid pearl. Indeed it seemeth to depend as the globe of the earth seemeth to hang in the air ; but yet it is firm and stable in itself. It is like a cube or die-form, which, toss it or throw it any way, it ever lighteth upon a square. . . . His falls are like the falls of Antœus ; they renew his strength : his clouds are like the clouds of harvest, which makes the sun break forth with greater force ; his wanes and changes are like the moon, whose globe is all light towards the sun, when it is all dark towards the world ; such is the excellency of her nature and of his estate."

Next take a passage from the *Advancement of Learning* (1,605). Though published twenty years before the last edition of the Essays it is no less periodic in structure and hardly less rich in style than the passage quoted by Lord Macaulay from the latter.

"Neither is certainly that other merit of learning, in repressing the inconveniences which grow from man to man, much inferior to the former, of relieving the necessities which arise from nature ; which merit was lively set forth by the ancients in that feigned relation of Orpheus' theatre ; where all the beasts and birds assembled, and forgetting their several appetites, some of prey, some of game, some of quarrel, stood all sociably together listening to the airs and accords of the

harp; the sound thereof no sooner ceased or was drowned by some louder noise, but every beast returned to his own nature. Wherein is aptly described the condition of men; who are full of savage and unreclaimed desires of profit, of lust, of revenge; which as long as they give ear to precepts, to laws, to religion, sweetly touched with eloquence, and persuasion of books, of sermons, of harangues, so long is society and peace maintained; but if these instruments be silent, or that sedition and tumult make them not audible, all things dissolve into anarchy and confusion."

On the other hand, the History of Henry VII., written 1,621, although for the most part periodic in structure, yet by its abruptness and occasional roughness, its colloquial phrases and homely metaphor, often reminds us of the earlier Essays. . . . It would seem that Bacon's habit of collecting choice words and phrases, to express his meaning exactly, briefly or ornately, had from a very early date the effect of repelling some of his hearers by the interspersed of unusual expressions and metaphors. Fresh from hearing an argument of Mr. Francis Bacon in the year 1,594, "in a most famous Chequer Chamber case," a young lawyer thus records his impressions:—

"His argument contracted by the time, seemed a *bataille servée* as hard to be discovered as conquered. The unusual words wherewith he had spangled his speech were rather gracious for their propriety than strange for their novelty, and like to serve both for occasions to report and means to remember his argument. Certain sentences of his, somewhat obscure, and as it were presuming on their capacities, will, I fear, make some of them admire rather than commend him." . . . "It would, therefore, be more in accordance with fact to call attention to this singularity of language, largeness of vocabulary, and richness of illustrations as distinguishing Bacon's style to some extent *in every period, and especially in his early period*, than to lay stress upon any imaginary development of the bold early style into a late florid one."—Abbott's "Francis Bacon."

Bearing in mind that the *Essay of Love* first appeared in the year 1612, when Bacon was 52 years of age, if we turn again to Lord Tennyson, we shall find his dictum, "Sir, don't be a fool," if not strictly original, at any rate excellent advice; but the question naturally arises, What constitutes a fool? It is usually allowed that a person who gives sentence in a cause which he does not fully understand without having made any attempt to investigate the evidence, may be placed



in this category; but at least it is rather hard that Baconians should be charged with fatuity because they consider that a poet, in cold blood, at the age of 52, sitting down to write an essay on love, need not necessarily treat of the passion in the language in which Romeo in the orchard or Juliet at the window express themselves. Bacon had by this time learned that "whosoever esteemeth too much of amorous affection quitteth both riches and wisdom. . . . As if man, made for the contemplation of Heaven and all noble objects, should do nothing but kneel before a little idol, and make himself subject not of the mouth (as beasts are), yet of the eye, which was given him for higher purposes."—*Essay of Love*.

Taking these things into consideration, it is not surprising to find Bacon speaking rather in the language of Mercutio than that of Romeo.

Says Bacon: "Speaking in a perpetual hyperbole is comely in nothing but in love. . . . For there was never proud man thought so absurdly well of himself, as the lover does of the person loved."

*Mercutio*.—"Now is he for the numbers that Petrarch flowed in. Laura to his lady was but a kitchen-wench. Dido a dowdy, Cleopatra a gipsy, Helen and Hero hildings and harlots, Thesbe a grey eye or so, but not to the purpose."—*Rom. Juliet* II. iv. 37.

"The lover all as frantic,  
Sees Helen's beauty in a brow of Egypt."

—*M. N. D.*, V. i. 10.

*Bacon*.—"And therefore it was well said it is impossible to love and be wise."

*Shakespeare*.—

"For to be wise and love,  
Exceeds man's might that dwells with gods above."

—*Troilus and Cressida* iii. 2.

"You may observe that amongst all the great and worthy persons (whereof the memory remaineth either ancient or recent) there is not one that has been transported to the mad degree of love, which shows that great spirits and great business do keep out this weak passion. You must except, nevertheless, Marcus Antonius, the half-partner of the Empire of Rome, and Appius Claudius."

It is to be observed that in the Plays Mark Anthony is the only "great and worthy person" who is "transported to the mad degree of love"—that is, who is so blinded by love as

to become oblivious to his better interests. Henry V., Henry VIII., Hector, Julius Cæsar, though "they cannot but admit love, yet make it keep quarter." Othello's ruin is due to jealousy, not love. A commentary on a text found in Bacon's *Essay of Suspicion*: "Suspensions that are artificially nourished and put into men's heads by the tales and whisperings of others have stings."

"This passion has his floods in the very times of weakness, which are great prosperity and great adversity, though this latter hath been less observed."—*Essay of Love*.

It is hardly necessary to point out to any reader of Shakespeare how much the latter point, that adversity is an incentive to love, is brought out in the Plays: the keynote is struck in the *Midsummer Night's Dream*, "The course of true love never did run smooth," and from this Play to *Winter's Tale*, the goal of true love, as approached by the straight path of adversity.

Thus we find that Bacon's *Essay of Love*, instead of being "throughout at the Antipodes to Shakespeare ideas and ideals of love," actually agrees at least in six distinct features with the opinions expressed in the Plays—namely, that martial men are given to love as they are given to wine; that speaking in a perpetual hyperbole is allowable in love; that there was never proud man thought so absurdly well of himself as the lover does of the person loved; that it is impossible to love and to be wise; that great and worthy persons are not transported to the mad degree of love, and that love hath his floods in times of great adversity.

There can be little doubt that Bacon, mature in years and judgment, had come to look on love rather as a hindrance than a help to man in accomplishing what he held to be the aim and object of his being "the contemplation of Heaven and all noble objects." Indeed the whole spirit and intention of the *Essay* is to warn men against allowing their higher and nobler parts to become entangled in the meshes of the senses. It is curious to find Hamlet giving voice to the same warning almost in the words of the *Essay*:—

"What is a man,  
If the chief good and market of his time  
Be but to sleep and feed? a beast, no more.  
Sure he that made us with such large discourse,  
Looking before and after gave us not  
That capability and god-like reason,  
To fust in us unused."—*Hamlet*, iv. 4.



Let anyone who considers that Bacon's style is altogether unlike that of Shakespeare turn again to the quotations given by Dr. Abbot (who, by the way, does not believe that Bacon wrote the Plays, and cannot therefore be accused of giving prominence to these passages in Baconian interests). Let him take the passage dealing with "Orpheus' Theatre," and compare it with a similar passage in the *Merchant of Venice*. By Bacon "the airs and accords of the harp" are used to illustrate the influence of learning, by Shakespeare the power of music; in each instance the effect is the subduing of "savage and unreclaimed desires" and the bringing into play of the gentler and purer emotions. With regard to the style, it is interesting to note how naturally Shakespeare falls into the triple mode of expression which is one of the characteristics of Bacon's prose:—

"Therefore the poet  
Did feign that Orpheus drew *trees, stones, and floods*;  
Since nought so *stockish, hard, and full of rage*,  
But music for the time doth change his nature."  
—*Merchant of Venice*, v. i.

Compare this with the closing lines of the passage quoted above. The impressions of the young lawyer quoted by Dr. Abbot from Spedding deserve the attention of all Baconians, because they represent Bacon in 1594 employing in his "Argument" a peculiarity of style which must have struck even the most casual reader of Shakespeare—the use of unusual words, "rather gracious for their propriety than strange for their novelty." The daring with which Shakespeare introduces unusual words is only surpassed by the wonderful appropriateness with which they are used. Even after three hundred years, we marvel at their "novelty," but feel at the same time that no other word is so exactly suitable. Dr. Abbot calls attention to Bacon's "largeness of vocabulary." Professor Craik tells us that Shakespeare had a vocabulary of twenty-one thousand words, three times that of Milton, more than four times that of Thackeray, and yet we are asked to believe that the Plays were written by a Warwickshire peasant, whose knowledge of languages consisted in what he picked from Lily's Latin Grammar, and who, as far as we know, accomplished no journey but that from Stratford to London and back.

E. S. ALDERSON.

## I.—THE CHRONICLE PLAYS.

IN *Advancement of Learning* (ii. 7) Bacon discusses, “*The partition of perfect history, into Chronicles of Times, Lives of Persons, Relations of Acts.*” Here Bacon comes in contact, and actually touches upon, the “*History of Great Brittany*,” and it is here we must seek, if anywhere, for allusions, or parallels, pointing to the Chronicle Plays, called Shakespeare’s. Bacon commences :—

“*Just or perfect history* is of three kinds, according to the nature of the object, which it propounds to represent, for it either represents a portion of time, or some memorable person, or some famous act. The first we call *Chronicles or Annals*; the second *Lives*; the third *Relations*. Of these, *Chronicles* seem to excel for celebrity and name; *Lives*, for profit and examples; *Relations*, for sincerity and verity” (*Advt. Learning* vii. 93). After discussing the value of each of these divisions, Bacon proceeds to say: “As touching those points which seem *deficient* in these three kinds of history, without doubt there are many particular histories of some dignity or mediocrity; but leaving the stories of foreign nations to the care of foreign persons, I cannot fail to represent unto your Majesty, the indignity and unworthiness of the *History of England*, as it now is, in the main continuation thereof, as also the partiality and obliquity of that of Scotland, in the latest and largest author thereof” (*Advt. L.*, Book II., 94). In the three kinds of histories—*Chronicles*, *Lives*, and *Relations*—we have exactly what Bacon understands as perfect history. And when we turn to chap. xiii., Book II. *Advt. Learning* (pages 105, 106), we find Bacon, dividing poetry into exactly the same three divisions, under the same nomenclature. He writes:—

“Under the name of *Poesy* we treat only of *History* feigned at pleasure, the truest partition of *Poesy*, and most appropriate besides those divisions common to it with *History* (for there are feigned *Chronicles*, feigned *Lives*, and feigned *Relations*) is this, that it is either *Narrative*, or *Representative*, or *Allusive*. *Narrative* is a mere imitation of *History*, that in a manner it deceives us; but that often it extols matters above belief. *Dramatical*, or *Representative*, is, as it were, a visible *History*; for it sets out the image of things, as if they were present, and *History* as if they were past,” (p. 106, *Advt. of Learning*, 1640).

Bacon’s determination to identify his *Chronicles of Times*,



his Lives of Persons, and his Relations of Acts, with Poesy (as feigned Chronicles, feigned Lives, feigned Relations), is one of those transparencies, which tell us, that the Historical Chronicle Plays, belong to the realm of Poesy, and to that particular branch of it, which Bacon calls, a visible History—i.e., *Dramatical or Representative Poesy*. We have discovered Bacon introducing the subject of a History of Britain, under this head of a just, or perfect history—viz., embracing a mixture of the *Chronicles of Times, Lives of Persons, Relations of Acts*, and we meet again with these three, as divisions common to poetry, and dramatical, or representative poetry also. It is plain that some powerful, and cogent reason, urged Bacon to draw his definition, of a just and perfect history, under the heading of Poesy and the Drama! For what is a poetical history of England (like the Chronicle Plays) but the *Relations of Acts, the Lives of Persons, and the Chronicle of Times*? Indeed, under this “*seeming deficiency*” (p. 94), Bacon proposes somebody should write, “The story of England from the uniting of the Roses to the uniting of the kingdoms: a space of time, which in my judgment, contains more variety of rare events, than in like number of successions, ever was known in an hereditary kingdom, for it begins with the mixed title to a crown, partly by might, partly by right—an entry by arms, an establishment by marriage; so these followed times answerable to these beginnings: *like waves after a great tempest, retaining their swellings and agitations, but without extremity of storm, but well passed through by the wisdom of the pilot, being one of the most sufficient kings of all his predecessors*” (*Adv. of Learning* ii., p. 95).

Let it be noted, that Bacon complains only, “Of the indignity and unworthiness, of the history of England, as it now is, *in the main continuation thereof*” (p. 94), and that his recommendation to the king, of a history of England, and Scotland united (as Great Britain), is only to commence, from the date of the union of the Roses, under Henry VII. Perhaps Bacon was quite aware, that the history of England, prior to these events, had already been so performed, that it was scarcely necessary to propose a re-writing of it. Bacon speaks of the times, preceding the union of the Roses, as a *period of great agitation, of stress and storm, likened to a great tempest*. Now, it is just after this simile of swelling waves, and stormy waters, that we find the Wars of the Roses, described, in the Plays of *Henry VI.* and *Richard III.* For example, Queen Margaret likens her son Prince Edward of Lancaster, heir to the throne, to the

*pilot of the ship of state, coming through the storms and shipwreck of civil war.* Also, Bacon uses, just this same simile of *pilot* for Henry VII., who was the next Lancastrian successor to this Prince Edward, after Richard III. had fallen at Bosworth Field:—

“ Great lords, wise men ne’er sit and wail their loss,  
But cheerly seek how to redress their harms.  
What though the mast be now blown overboard,  
The cable broke, the holding anchor lost,  
And half our sailors swallowed in the flood?  
*Yet lives our pilot still.* Is’t meet that he  
Should leave the helm, and like a fearful lad  
With tearful eyes add water to the sea,  
And give more strength to that which hath too much,  
Whiles, in his moan, the ship splits on the rock,  
Which industry and courage might have saved?  
Ah, what a shame! Ah, what a fault were this!  
Say Warwick was our anchor; what of that?  
And Montague our topmast; what of him?  
Our slaughtered friends the tackles; what of these?  
Why, is not Oxford here another anchor?  
And Somerset, another goodly mast?  
The friends of France our shrouds and tack-lines?  
And, though unskilful, *why not Ned and I,*  
*For once allow’d the skilful pilot’s charge?*  
We will not from the helm to sit and weep,  
But keep our course, though the rough wind say no,  
From shelves and rock that threaten us with wreck.  
As good to chide the waves as speak them fair.  
And what is Edward but a ruthless sea?  
What Clarence but a quicksand of deceit?  
And Richard but a ragged, fatal rock?  
All these the enemies to our poor bark.  
Say you can swim; alas! ’tis but a while!  
Tread on the sand; why, there you quickly sink;  
Bestride the rock; the tide will wash you off,  
Or else you famish—that’s a threefold death.  
This speak I, lords, to let you understand,  
In case some one of you would fly from us,  
That there’s no hoped for mercy with the brothers,  
More than with ruthless waves, with sands and rocks.”

—3 *Henry VI.* 5, iv.

The “*extremity of storm*,” to which Bacon alludes, are the *tempestuous troubles* of the reign of Richard III., with whose end, the storms of the civil wars, of the Roses ceased, in the union by marriage, of the two houses. These troubles, caused by the minority of the young princes, are thus prophesied and alluded to in *Richard III.*:—

*Third Cit.*—“Woe to that land that’s governed by a child.”

*Second Cit.*—“In him there is a hope of government,  
That, in his nonage, council under him,  
And in his full and ripened years himself,  
No doubt, shall then and till then govern well.”



*First Cit.*—"So stood the state when Henry the Sixth.  
Was crown'd in Paris but at nine years old."

*Third Cit.*—"When clouds appear, wise men put on their cloaks;  
When great leaves fall, the winter is at hand;  
*When the sun sets, who doth not look for night?*  
*Untimely storms make men expect a dearth."*

*Third Cit.*—"Before the times of change, still is it so:  
By a divine instinct, men's minds mistrust  
Ensuing dangers, as by proof we see  
*The waters swell before a boisterous storm,*  
But leave it all to God."

—*Rich. III.* 2, iii.

Here are Bacon's identical words—"waters swell,"—"waves retaining their swellings,"—with the only difference, that Bacon writes of these self-same troubles, as *after they were passed*, and the passage in the Play, is a presentiment of them *before they occurred!* But the real text, which touches this subject, is to be found, in the opening words, of Bacon's Essay upon *Seditions and Troubles*:—

"*Shepherds of people* had need know the *calendars of Tempests* in State, which are commonly greatest, when things grow to equality, as natural Tempests are greatest about the *Æquinoclia*. And as there are certain hollow blasts of wind, and *secret swelling of seas, before a Tempest*, so are there in states."

"Ille etiam cœcos instare tumultus  
Sæpe monet, Fraudesque, et operta tumescere bella."

"He [*i.e.*, the Sun] also, often warns of threatening hidden tumults, and treacheries, and of secret wars, swelling to a head."—(Virgil, *Georgics* i. 465.)

We have in this passage the same image that Bacon uses for the troubles of State, that were known, as the Wars of the Roses,—"*Secret swelling of seas before a Tempest!*" This "agitation of stress and storm," belongs to that period, when the rival factions of the Houses of York and Lancaster, *grew to equality*, when Henry VI. was *the Shepherd of his people*, and also to the period when hidden tumults and troubles (such as the sedition of Jack Cade), grew to a head. The treacheries of Richard Duke of Gloucester, afterwards Richard III., seem to be also here hinted at. But the passage is so wonderfully reflected in these Chronicle Plays, in every particular, that we propose to quote Virgil's original text upon the subject:—

"The sun reveals the secrets of the sky,  
 And who dares give the source of life the lie?  
*The change of Empires often he declares,  
 Fierce tumults, hidden treasons, open wars!*  
 He first the fate of Cæsar did foretell,  
 And pitied Rome when Rome in Cæsar fell;  
 In inky clouds concealed the public light,  
 And impious mortals feared eternal night."

—*Georgics* (Dryden's Translation).

The greater part of the prodigies, or portents, which preceded the death of Julius Cæsar (*Jul. Cæs.*, I. ii.) seem to be borrowed from Virgil's first *Georgic*. But let us take Bacon's text regularly, and *verbatim*, and apply it literally, to the Chronicle Plays of Henry VI. and Richard III.

Bacon uses the expression, "*Shepherds of people*,"\*—a very ancient expression, or image, for Kings, Protectors, or Governors of peoples! It is thus King David is styled in the Psalms. And directly we turn to the Plays in question, we find, first, the Protector Duke Humphrey, *styled a shepherd*, and Henry VI. also comparing himself to a shepherd. Good Duke Humphrey, when arrested, and deprived of the Protectorship, exclaims of himself:—

Gloucester.—"Ah! thus King Henry throws away his crutch  
 Before his legs be firm to bear his body.  
 Thus is the *Shepherd* beaten from thy side,  
 And wolves are gnarling who shall gnaw thee first."

—2 *K. Henry VI.*, Act III. i.

There is a deep philosophical and ethical purpose concealed behind the entire text and action of 3 *Henry VI.*, ii. 5. We first have the peaceful picture of a good king, watching the progress of the battle of Towton, and soliloquising upon the joys and happiness of a shepherd's life—a *life of peace and contemplation*.

"Ah what a life were this! how sweet! how lovely!  
 Gives not the hawthorn bush a sweeter shade  
 To *shepherds* looking on their silly sheep,  
 Than doth a rich embroidered canopy  
 To kings that fear their subjects treachery?"

\*Bacon writes: "To pass to the first event or occurrence after the Fall of Man, we see (as the Scriptures have infinite mysteries, not violating at all the truth of the story, or letter), *an image of the two states, the Contemplative and Active*, figured in the persons of Abel and Cain, and in their professions and primitive trades of life; whereof the one was a Shepherd, who by reason of his leisure, rest in a place, and free view of heaven, *is a lively image of a contemplative life*; the other a Husbandman, that is a man toiled and tired with working, and his countenance fixed upon the earth, *where we may see the favour and election of God went to the shepherd, and not to the tiller of ground*."—*Adv. Learning*, Book I., p. 43.



O yes it doth ; a thousand-fold it doth.  
 And to conclude the shepherd's homely curds,  
 His cold, thin drink out of his leather bottle,  
 His wonted sleep under a fresh tree's shade,  
 All which secure, and sweetly he enjoys,  
 Is far beyond a prince's delicates,  
 His viands sparkling in a golden cup,  
 His body couched in a curious bed,  
 When care, mistrust, and treason waits on him."

—3 *K. Henry VI.*, Act II. v.

Immediately on the conclusion of this monologue, we have a horrible scene, or episode, borrowed from the battle-field—a son who has killed his father dragging in the dead body ; and presently, another episode—a father that has killed his son bringing in the dead body !

That these two pictures, of the horrors of civil war, are intentionally introduced, with an ethical purpose, of contrast with the pacific character, and speech of the king, cannot be doubted, because Richmond (*Henry VII.*) is made to conclude the Play of *Richard III.* with words which refer to these horrors of the civil wars of the Roses :—

"England hath long been mad, and scarr'd herself ;  
 The brother blindly shed the brother's blood,  
 The father rashly slaughter'd his own son,  
 The son, compell'd, been butcher to the sire :  
 All this divided York and Lancaster—  
 Divided in their dire division."—*Richard III.*, Act V. iii.

In the following passage will be perceived, Bacon's metaphor of contending day and night :—

*King.*—"This battle fares like to the morning's war,  
 When dying clouds contend with growing lig'it,  
 What time the shepherd, blowing of his nails,  
 Can neither call it perfect day nor night.  
 Forced by the tide to combat with the wind :  
 Now sways it this way, like a mighty sea,  
 Now one the better, then another best ;  
 Both tugging to be victors, breast to breast,  
 Yet neither conqueror, nor conquered :  
 So is the equal poise of this fell war."

—3 *K. Henry VI.*, Act II. v.

This picture, applied not only to the battle, but to the entire war, illustrates fully Bacon's words, that Tempests of State are commonly greatest when things grow to equality, "as natural tempests are greatest about the *Æquinocxia*" (*Seditions and Troubles*). *Æquinocxia*, means equal day and equal night, or "*equal poise*," and the entire passage we cite, is pregnant with this hint, of "*equal poise*," compared to

a mighty tempest, or battle between wind and tide.\* Bacon signifies that equality of parties, not only prolongs a struggle, but makes it fiercer, and to rage more violently, inasmuch as neither party can overcome the other—just as when dying clouds contend with growing light.

The most perfect example of these secrets, of the sun, and sky, showing, as it were, sympathy with fierce tumults, hidden treasons, open wars, is to be found, just before the battle of Shrewsbury, in the first part of *Henry IV.*, when the revolt, or sedition of Hotspur and Douglas was put down :—

*King.*—"How bloodily the sun begins to peer  
Above yon busky hill! The day looks pale  
At his distemperature."

*Prince.*—"The Southern wind  
Doth play the trumpet to his purposes,  
And by his hollow whistling in the leaves  
Foretells a tempest and a blustering day."

*King.*—"Then with the losers let it sympathise,  
For nothing can seem foul to those that win."

—1 *Henry IV.*, Act V. i.

Observe Bacon's hand, "*certain hollow blasts of wind*," in the two lines, placed in italics. What a magnificent prelude for the *tempest of battle* which follows this scene! How we seem to behold the character of the day, and feel the poet's divine awe, inspired into these outward portents, discordant and hollow voices of the air, tuning for the coming fray! So again, we find Edward and Richard, not long before the battle of Towton, beholding *three suns* :—

*Edward.*—"Dazzle mine eyes, or I do see three suns?"

*Richard.*—"Three glorious suns, each one a perfect sun;  
Not separated with the racking clouds,  
But sever'd in a pale, clear shining sky.  
See, see! they join, embrace, and seem to kiss,  
As if they vow'd some league inviolable:  
Now are they but one lamp, one light, one sun,  
In this the heaven figures some event."

—3 *K. Henry VI.*, Act II. i.

\* Salisbury exclaims of King Richard II. :—

"Thy sun sets weeping in the lowly West,  
Witnessing storms to come, woe and unrest.  
Thy friends are fled to wait upon thy foes."

—*K. Richard II.*, Act II. iv. 21.

Another passage illustrates Bacon :—"For that more men adored the sun rising than the sun setting."—*Friendship Essays*, 1625. Compare :

*Clifford.*—"Impairing Henry, strengthening misproud York,  
The common people swarm like summer flies;  
And whither fly the gnats but to the sun?"

—3 *Henry VI.*, Act II. vi.



Let it be noticed that Bacon's words, "an entry by arms ; an establishment by marriage," which alludes to the succession of King Henry VII., finds reflection in the Play of *Richard III.*, first, in the battle and victory of Bosworth, and in these words of the king :—

"We will unite the white rose and the red ;  
Smile, heaven, upon this fair conjunction,  
That long have frown'd upon their enmity."

—*Richard III.*, Act V. iii.

Before the battle of Bosworth, Richmond exclaims :—

"The weary sun hath made a golden set,  
And, by the bright track of his fiery car,  
Gives signal of a goodly day to-morrow."

—*K. Richard III.*, Act V. ii.

On the other hand, we find King Richard III. asking for a *Calendar*, just before the battle, in order to consult the *time of sunrise*.

*K. Richard.*—"Tell the clock there. Give me a *calendar*.  
Who saw the sun to-day ?"

*Ratcliff.*—"Not I, my lord."

*K. Richard.*—"Then he disdains to shine ; for by the book  
He should have braved the East an hour ago,  
A black day will it be for somebody."

*Richard III.*, Act V. iii. 280.

Let us recall Bacon's text:—"Shepherds of people had need know the *Calendar of Tempests*\* in state ;" which paraphrased means, "Kings had need know the time (or hour) of political storms, and troubles, so as to be able to be prepared for them." Bacon intends also to illustrate the sympathy and antipathy of the heavens, and external nature, with the issues and fortunes of great events and battles upon the world's stage. Nature is not a mere spectator only, but gives secret tokens and presentiments of things to come. Thus Richard III. exclaims :—

"The sun will not be seen to-day ;  
The sky doth frown and lour upon our army.  
I would these dewy tears were from the ground,  
Not shine to-day ! Why, what is that to me,  
More than to Richmond ? For the self-same heaven,  
That frown on me looks sadly upon him."—*Ib.*

Let it be further pointed out, that the alternate successes and defeats, of the rival Houses of York and Lancaster, are

\* Bacon's imagery of *tempests*, applied to wars and battles, is to be found abundantly in the Plays. Warwick exclaims to Clifford :—

"To keep thee from the *tempest* of the field."

—*Richard III.*, Act V. iii.

compared to the succession of winter and summer, or we might say, to the equinoxes. Richard III. directly he ascends the throne, exclaims :—

“ Now is the *winter* of our discontent  
Made glorious *summer* by this *sun* of York.”

*K. Richard III.* Act I. i.

So, in like manner, Richard's “glorious summer,” *was made winter again*, by Richmond (at the battle of Bosworth), by the sun of Lancaster rising whilst the sun of York set. This is no fanciful theory, but is a metaphor very consistently, and widely applied to the Plays. In Richard II. we read :—

“ Men judge by the complexion of the sky  
The state and inclinations of the day.”

And Bacon applies this idea politically, in a profound metaphor, which gives us a key for the authorship of these Chronicle Plays.

“ From Richard's night to Bolingbroke's fair day,” (*Ib.*)

is the same sort of imagery, borrowed from the sun :—

“ See, see, King Richard doth himself appear,  
As doth the blushing, discontented sun.”—Act III. iii.

It is at the time of the equinoxes that winter and summer, in their struggle of light over darkness, and *vice versa*, commence. It is true we have two grades, or shades, of these oppositions, called spring and autumn, but practically it is at the equinoxes that light and darkness prevail over one another, and it is this idea, of the conflict of light and darkness, which Bacon has applied, to the rising and setting of the suns of the Houses of York and Lancaster, and their rival factions. But we go farther than this. Bacon applies to government the image of *Primum Mobile*, wherein (as presently quoted) the greatest persons in a Government are compared to the planets, “*carried swiftly by the highest motion and softly in their own motion*,” meaning that as the King is the sun, so the nobles are planets obedient to the sun, yet revolving each in their particular or private motion. Compare this address of Henry IV. to the rebel nobles, Worcester and Vernon, just before the battle of Shrewsbury :—

“ What say you to it? Will you again unknit  
This churlish knot of all-aborred war?  
And move in that obedient orb again  
Where you did give a fair and natural light,  
And be no more an exhaled meteor.”

1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act V., i.



Bacon states that one of the causes of seditions and troubles, is *burthensome taxations*. The following passage illustrates this, and once more presents the seditions and troubles, arising in Ireland, and in England, from the approaching landing of Harry, Duke of Hereford, as a storm, or tempest !

*Willoughby* :—“ The King’s grown bankrupt like a broken man.”

*Northumberland* :—“ Reproach and dissolution hangeth over him.”

*Ross* :—“ He hath not money for these Irish wars,  
His burthensome taxations notwithstanding;  
But by the robbing of the banish’d duke.”

*North* :—“ His noble kinsman : most degenerate king !  
*But, lords, we hear this fearful tempest sing,  
Yet seek no shelter to avoid the storm ;  
We see the wind sit sore upon our sails,  
And yet we strike not, but securely perish.*”

*K. Richard II.*, Act II. iii.

In like manner, Bolingbroke says :—

“ It is such crimson *tempest* should bedrench  
The fresh green lap of fair King Richard’s land.”

—Act III. iii.

Bacon writes :—“ Neither let any prince, or state, be secure concerning discontentments (the alienation of minds, and the increase of envy), because they have often, or have been long, and yet no peril has ensued. For, as it is true, *that every vapour, or fume, doth not turn into a storm ;* so it is, nevertheless true, *that storms, though they blow over divers times, yet may fall at last.*”—*Seditions and Troubles*, 1625.

Compare Edward IV.’s speech on Barnet battle-field :—

*King* :—“ I spy a black, suspicious, threatening cloud,  
That will encounter with our glorious sun,  
Ere he attain his easeful western bed :  
I mean, my lords, those powers that the Queen  
Hath raised in Gallia have arrived our coast,  
And, as we hear, march on to fight with us.”

*Clarence* :—“ A little gale will soon disperse that cloud,  
And blow it to the source from whence it came :  
The very beams will dry those vapours up,  
*For every cloud engenders not a storm.*”

3 *K. Henry VI.*, Act V. iii.

Here are Bacon’s own expressions, “ vapour,” “ storm,” in the same metaphors, applied to exactly the same things, risings and war troubles ! The context fully carries out the hint Bacon gives us. Edward affected to fear, and Clarence to deprecate, the danger threatening from the invasion of Queen Margaret, who was joined by Somerset and Oxford—her forces being thirty thousand strong. Clarence’s light treatment of the war cloud threatening the King, found its

rebuke in the battle of Tewkesbury, which immediately follows this dialogue quoted. Queen Margaret's speech opens Sc. iv., and to this speech we have already drawn attention.

Bacon writes: "It is commonly seen that men once placed, take in with the contrary faction to that by which they enter; thinking belike that they have the first sure, *and now are ready for a new purchase.*"—*Essays. Faction.*

This change of coat, or party, is fully realized in the character of Earl Warwick, called the King-maker. Edward IV., alluding to this, exclaims:—

"Write in the dust this sentence with thy blood,  
Windchanging Warwick now can change no more."

3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. i.

Bacon's wonderful insight into motives of this sort, is fully realized in the political arena of this present day. Men commence by being either Conservatives, or Liberals, and often go over to the other side, for the sake of the purchase price they obtain (by so doing), be it title, office, promotion, preferment, or social gain. Note, how Earl Warwick is *identified with the wind*. Bacon writes:—"That the people were like the sea, would be quiet *if the orators, like the wind, did not put them into agitation.*" (*Adv. L.*, Bk. VII., p. 354). Warwick is described as follows:—

"Ay, now begins a second storm to rise;  
For this is he that moves both wind and tide."

—3 *K. Henry VI.*, Act III. iii.

The Duke of York exclaims:—

"I will stir up in England some black storm,  
Shall blow ten thousand souls to heaven, or hell;  
And this fell *tempest* shall not cease to rage,  
Until the golden circuit on my head,  
Like to the glorious sun's transparent beams,  
Do calm the fury of this mad-bred flaw."

—2 *K. Henry VI.*, Act III. i.

Observe the Baconian imagery—storm—tempest—sun. It was this Duke of York, who incited Jack Cade to sedition, and who stirred up trouble, expressly to further his ambition for the crown. Kings are always compared to suns in the Plays. For example, *Henry VIII.* and *Francis the First* are compared to suns:—

*Buck.*—

"When  
Those *suns of glory*, those two lights of men,  
Met in the field of Andren."—*Henry VIII.*, Act I. i.

*Richard II.*—"O that I were a mockery King of snow,  
Standing before the sun of Bolingbroke ;  
To melt myself away in water drops."

—*K. Richard II.*, Act IV. i.

*Henry V.* is described :—

"His sparkling eyes, replete with wrathful fire,  
More dazzled and drove back his enemies,  
Than mid-day sun fierce bent against their faces."

—1 *K. Henry VI.*, Act I. i.

Bacon, on the accession of James the First, writes to Mr. Faules : "We all thirst after the King's coming, accounting all this, but as the dawning of the day, *before the rising of the sun*, till we have his presence" (letter to Mr. Faules, 28th March, 1603, p. 24, *Resuscitatio* 1661, letter). "Yet we account it, but a fair morn *before sun rising*, before his Majestie's presence" (Letter to Mr. Kemp, *Ib.*).

*K. Henry V.*—"But I will rise there with so full a glory,  
That I will dazzle all the eyes of France ;  
Yea, strike the Dauphin blind to look on us."

—*Henry V.*, Act I. ii. 278.

In a very striking metaphor, Bacon compares, *civil war to a fever*, because it occurs, *within the body politic* :—"A civil war, indeed, is like the heat of a fever, but a foreign war, is like the heat of exercise" (*Greatness of Kingdoms*, 1625). Again :—"In the *politic body* (discontentments) are like to humours in the *natural (body)*, which are apt to gather a praternatural heat, and to inflame" (*Essays Seditions and Troubles*, 1625).

This idea is fully carried out in the Plays, with regard to the civil wars of the reigns of *Richard II.* and *Henry IV.* The Archbishop of York exclaims :—

"Briefly to this end : we are all diseased,  
And with our surfeiting and wanton hours,  
Have brought ourselves into a burning fever,  
And we must bleed for it ; of which disease ;  
Our late King, Richard, being infected, died.  
But, my most noble Lord of Westmoreland,  
I take not on me here as a physician ;  
Nor do I as an enemy to peace,  
Troop in the throngs of military men ;  
But rather show awhile like fearful war,  
To diet rank minds, sick of happiness ;  
And purge the obstructions, which begin to stop  
Our very veins of life."—2 *K. Henry IV.*, Act IV. i.

It is of war, of rebellion, of base and bloody insurrection, that this passage *alone refers to*. This Baconian sickness of the state, or body politic, once more appears in the following :—



*King*.—"Then you perceive the body of our Kingdom,  
How foul it is; what rank diseases grow,  
And with what danger near the heart of it."

*Warwick*.—"It is but as a body, yet it is distemper'd;  
Which to his former strength may be restored,  
With good advice and little medicine."

—2 *K. Henry IV.*, Act III. i.

In 1 *Henry VI.* we find Vernon and Basset (respectively of the White Rose, or York faction, and of the Red Rose, or Lancaster faction), openly quarrelling *in court, in the presence of the King and Gloucester*, and being reprov'd for so doing by the latter :—

*Glou.*—"Confounded be your strife!  
And perish ye, with your audacious prate!  
Presumptuous vassals, are you not ashamed,  
With this immodest, clamorous outrage,  
To trouble and disturb the King and us?"

—1 *K. Henry VI.*, Act IV. i. 123.

Exeter comments upon this open carrying of faction in court, thus :—

"But howso'er, no simple man that sees,  
This jarring discord of nobility,  
This shouldering of each other in the court,  
This factious bandying of their favorites,  
But that it doth presage some ill event."—*Ib.*

In the same *Essay of Seditions and Troubles*, Bacon writes upon this point of *carrying faction openly*, as follows, wherein it will be perceived the text is exactly illustrated by the above lines cited. "Also, when discords, and quarrels, and *factions, are carried openly, and audaciously*; it is a sign, the reverence of government is lost. For the motions of the greatest persons, in a government, ought to be, as the motions of the planets, under *Primum Mobile*; according to the old opinion, which is, that everyone of them, is carried swiftly by the highest motion, and softly in their own motion. And therefore, when great ones, in their own particular motion move violently, and as Tacitus expresseth it well, '*Liberius quam ut Imperantium meminissent*,' it is a sign, the orbs are out of frame. For reverence is that wherewith princes are girt from God, who threatens the dissolving thereof, '*Solvam Cingula Regum*.' So when any of the four pillars of government, are mainly shaken, or weakened (which are Religion, Justice, Counsel, and Treasure) *men had used to pray for fair weather*" (*Seditions and Troubles*, 1625). In the Latin the word government is rendered "*Erga Principem*," towards the sovereign.

In the same scene, we find the King, *putting on a red rose*, and exclaiming :—

"Let me be umpire in this doubtful strife ;  
I see no reason, if I wear this rose,"

(Putting on a red rose)

"That anyone should therefore be suspicious  
I more incline to Somerset than York."

—1 K. Henry VI., Act IV. i.

\* \* \* \* \*

Nevertheless, this act of the King, was interpreted as a leaning towards the faction of Lancaster, as witness Exeter's remarks :—

Warwick.—"My Lord of York, I promise you, the King  
Prettily, methought, did play the orator."

Exeter.—"And so he did, but yet I like it not,  
In that he wears the badge of Somerset."—*Ib.*

This finds illustration in Bacon's words upon the causes of seditions and troubles :—"Also, as Macchiavel noteth well, when Princes that ought to be common parties, make themselves as a party, and lean to a side, it is as a boat that is overthrown by uneven weight on the one side. For when the authority of Princes is made but an accessory to a cause, and there be other bands that tie faster than the band of sovereignty, Kings begin to be put almost out of possession of authority" (*Seditions and Troubles*, 1625). This was completely realized in the case of Henry VI., who was almost put out of authority, by the factions, and bands, of the houses of York and Lancaster. The King in permitting the intrigue of Cardinal Beaufort, of the Queen, and Suffolk, to succeed in the deposing of good Duke Humphrey, of Gloucester, from the protectorship, sealed his own fate, and became lost in the rivalry of the factions, and the jealousies, which his leaning to one faction caused. The subject is too large a one to enter upon in this paper, but the "*factions and the bands*," Bacon hints at, may be clearly realized in the power of Warwick, the King-maker, who possessed the secret of tieing, or binding together his party. A corroboration of Bacon's hint, is found in the fact, he repeats the observation in his Essay upon Faction. "Kings had need beware how they side themselves, and make themselves as of a faction or party" (*Factioni alicui Subditorum suorum*) (*Faction. Essays*, 1625).

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

MR. S. LEE'S *LIFE OF SHAKESPEARE*.

IN his Preface to his *Life of Shakespeare*, which was recently awarded a prize of fifty guineas by the Editor of *The Academy*, as one of the three best books of the year 1898, Mr. Lee states that "Shakesporean literature, as far as it is known to me, still lacks a book that shall supply within a brief compass an exhaustive and well-arranged statement of the facts of Shakespeare's career, achievement, and reputation; that shall reduce conjecture to the smallest dimensions consistent with coherence, and shall give verifiable references to all the original sources of information." That book is still to come, as Mr. Lee's *Life* is, from start to finish, not "a statement of facts," but a huge mass of conjecture.

Here are a few of the conjectures, picked out at haphazard from the work :—

"There is every probability that his ancestors."

"Probably his birthplace."

"Some doubt is justifiable as to the ordinarily accepted scene of his birth."

"All the evidence points to the conclusion."

"One of them doubtless the alleged birthplace."

"There is no inherent improbability in the tale."

"William probably entered the school."

"There seems good ground for regarding."

"Probably in 1577 he was enlisted by his father."

"It is possible that John's ill-luck."

"Shakespeare's friends may have called the attention of the strolling players to the homeless lad."

"The wedding probably took place."

"The circumstances make it highly improbable."

"Renders it improbable."

"It is unlikely that."

"It seems possible."

"Probably his ignorance of affairs."

"From such incidents doubtless sprang."

"He was doubtless another."

"His intellectual capacity and the amiability . . . were probably soon recognised."

"It is unsafe to assume."

"But there seems no doubt."

"All the evidence points to the conclusion."

"It is fair to infer."



"Justice Shallow is beyond doubt a reminiscence."

"The Rose was doubtless the earliest scene."

"It was doubtless performing."

"He doubtless owed all (*i.e.*, his realistic portrayal of Italian life and sentiment) to the verbal reports of travelled friends, or to books."

"Shakespeare may be credited with."

"The whole of Shakespeare's dramatic work was probably begun."

"It was, doubtless, to Shakespeare's personal relations."

"Shakespeare doubtless gained."

"There is no external evidence."

"It is just possible."

"The tirade was probably inspired."

"The many references to travel in the *Sonnets* were, doubtless, reminiscences."

"That Shakespeare visited any part of the Continent is even less probable."

"That Shakespeare joined any of these expeditions is highly improbable."

"Renders it almost impossible that he could have gathered his knowledge of Northern Italy from personal observation."

"It is in fact unlikely that Shakespeare ever set foot on the Continent of Europe."

"Shakespeare had probably Latin enough for the purpose."

"It was not probably with the object."

"Shakespeare may have seen."

"It was, doubtless, with the calculated aim."

"Shakespeare might find."

"He might clearly have acquired his knowledge."

"Probably of Shakespeare's."

"He probably had a practical knowledge of Latin."

"It is possible that some of his labours."

"Depends largely on conjecture."

"The play was revised, probably, for a performance."

"It was probably founded on a play."

"After having, in all probability, undergone some revision."

"It is possible that Shakespeare."

"He would doubtless have shown in his writings."

"They were doubtless put on the stage."

"Within a brief interval, possibly for a revival."

"The theme was doubtless first suggested."

"Was doubtless taken in hand."

"Doubtless the popular interest."

- "There is little doubt that Shakespeare."  
 "The scene was probably from the pen."  
 "In all probability the *Merry Wives*."  
 "We may assume."  
 "Tradition reports that Shakespeare joined."  
 "There is no ground for assuming."  
 "There is every indication that." } (Within eight lines.)  
 "There is a likelihood that." }  
 "There is no reason to dispute."  
 "It was probably about 1571 that William."  
 "It was probably in 1596 that Shakespeare."  
 "It was doubtless under Shakespeare's guidance."  
 "There is every reason to believe."  
 "Shakespeare was doubtless withdrawn."  
 "If, as is possible, it be by Shakespeare."  
 "Shakespeare does not appear to have."  
 "But in all probability he drew."  
 "In all probability it was."  
 "English actors may have brought."  
 "It is likely enough that."  
 "It is hardly possible to doubt."  
 "There is a likelihood, too."  
 "It is hardly doubtful that."  
 "There is every likelihood that."  
 "Doubtless, William."  
 "Shakespeare, doubtless, travelled."  
 "His summons to act at Court was possibly due."

And Mr. Lee calls this a *Life*! The whole story he relates is not that Shakespeare was the author, but that the dramas were allowed without challenge—and without a claim on the part of the reputed author—to pass as his. The *Life*, certainly, as we have shown from our extracts, does infinite credit to Mr. Lee's powers of invention and imagination. It is a pleasant little fable, the construction of which must have been attended with considerable poetic rapture. The *Life* is very amusing and very romantic, but as for the history or logic of the case, both are conspicuously absent; "the muse of history returns to the nursery, where she dresses up a doll, and puts on grandma's spectacles," as was once aptly said in the *Journal of the Bacon Society*, when Mrs. Stopes declared that Shakespeare drank "nectar," and Bacon "wine and beer." Mrs. Stopes might have suggested where the "nectar" was brewed.

The title, *Life of William Shakespeare*, which Mr. Sidney Lee has given to his book is, therefore, a misnomer. It is not a *Life*, but a learned and elaborate treatise, in which conjecture takes the place of fact, with a catalogue *raisonné* of certain Poems and Plays which were associated with the name of William Shakespeare, which Mr. Lee says William Shakespeare never claimed as his own; and absolutely detached from this, is an account of what is known of the man, with question-begging embellishments derived from the *Poems* and *Sonnets*. All that Mr. Lee says about William Shakespeare—and it is about as little as Mr. Halliwell-Phillips had to say in his *Outlines*—might be omitted, and the value of the book would not be in the least impaired.

Bacon, of course, is never mentioned in the body of the work; but Mr. Lee dismisses the Baconian case in a brief and contemptuous (as well as contemptible) "Appendix," implying that no solid argument on our side exists, and that we "have no rational right to a hearing," ascribing to us "defective knowledge, and illogical or casuistical argument." (How different the opinion of Mr. Gladstone, who stated, "Considering what Bacon was, I have always regarded the discussion as one *perfectly serious and to be respected*.") At the same time Mr. Lee quotes, in a dozen lines, the impression of Shakespeare's personal character as recorded by Chettle, the Parnassus poet, Anthony Scoloker, and Ben Jonson—all of them of doubtful relevance, especially the latter, who abused Shakespeare during his life, and praised him after his death, on the principle of *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*. As Mr. George Wyndham says in his recent work on the *Sonnets*:—"Jonson praised Shakespeare after his death, but not before it. Jonson was the leader of the learned fraternity of log-rollers." And then Mr. Lee is brought to confess that "no other contemporary left on record any definite impression of William Shakespeare's personal character."

In regard to the "Parallelisms," Mr. Lee declares that "most of them that are commonly quoted are phrases in ordinary use by all writers of the day"—a statement very far removed from the truth. With reference to the mistake made both in Bacon and Shakespeare as to the use of the words "*moral philosophy*" for "*political philosophy*," Mr. Lee advances the ingenious argument (not at all "illogical" or "casuistical," like the arguments of the Baconians) that Aristotle meant "moral" when he wrote "political." As was stated in the last number of *BACONIANA*, the only way



out of the difficulty is that both Shakespeare and Bacon knew what Aristotle meant, and corrected Aristotle accordingly!

As to the "Parallelisms" consisting, as Mr. Lee declares, of "phrases in ordinary use by all writers of the day," here are two specimens to which perhaps Mr. Lee will supply a third parallel from any of the works of the contemporaries of Shakespeare and Bacon:—

## SHAKESPEARE.

"I saw him run after a gilded butterfly; and, when he caught it, he let it go again; and after it again."

## SHAKESPEARE.

"Yet nature is made better by no mean.

But nature makes that mean: so, over that art

Which you say adds to nature, is an art

That nature makes. . . .

This is an art

Which does mend nature, change it rather, but

The art itself is nature."

## BACON.

"To be like a child following a bird, which, when he is nearest, flyeth away and lighteth a little before; and then the child after it again."

## BACON.

"I am the more induced to set down the History of the Arts as a species of Natural History, because an opinion has been long prevalent that Art is something different from Nature, and things artificial from things natural. Whereas men ought, on the contrary, to be surely persuaded of this—that the artificial does not differ from the natural in form or essence, but only in the efficient, . . . it is Nature which governs everything. . . . All I mean is that Nature, like Proteus, is forced by Art to do that which, without Art, would not be done."

Can Mr. Lee produce a passage in any work by any other Elizabethan writer in which this axiom—that "art is nature"—is enunciated? If he fails, I maintain the resemblance cannot be accidental, unless he insists that in the first example Shakespeare plagiarised from Bacon's *unpublished* works, and in the second Bacon plagiarised from Shakespeare, and then claimed the result as his own original theory. The dates of the first Parallelism (*Coriolanus* and *Letter to Greville*) are 1609 and 1595 respectively, and of the other (*A Winter's Tale* and *Description of the Intellectual Globe*) 1611 and 1611 or 1612.

Mr. Lee will not have it (for, observe, these conclusions are so many manifestations of self-will) that Shakespeare knew Greek. He says:—"The rudiments of Greek were occasionally taught in Elizabethan grammar schools to very promising pupils; but such coincidences as have been detected between expressions in Greek plays and in Shakespeare seem due to

accident, and not to any study, either at school or elsewhere, of the Athenian drama." Well, that the writer of the Shakespearean dramas had a knowledge of Greek—I do not say the Greek drama—I think I can prove to Mr. Lee. I have no doubt that if I can show him that "Shakespeare" was acquainted with Plato in the original, he may acknowledge that "Shakespeare" knew more than "the rudiments of Greek occasionally taught in Elizabethan grammar schools."

In 1 *Henry VI.*, I. vi. appear the lines:—

"Thy promises are like Adonis' gardens,  
That one day bloomed, and fruitful were the next."

On this Schmidt, in his *Lexicon*, remarks:—"Perhaps confounded with the garden of King Alcinous in the *Odyssey*." While the eminent Shakespearean scholar, R. S. White, says:—"No mention of any such garden in the classic writings of Greece and Rome is known to scholars." The reference has always been a puzzle to critics, till recently it was discovered that the couplet must have been suggested by Plato, in whose *Phaedrus*, as translated by Jowett, we find the following:—"Would a husbandman, said Socrates, who is a man of sense, take the seeds, which he values and which he wishes to be fruitful, and in sober earnest plant them during the heat of summer, *in some garden of Adonis*, that he may rejoice when he sees them in eight days appearing in beauty? Would he not do that, if at all, to please the spectators at a festival? But the seeds about which he is in earnest he sows in fitting soil, and practices husbandry, and is satisfied if in eight months they come to perfection."

"Oh," Mr. Sidney Lee will say, "what about that? Shakespeare got it from a translation." But unfortunately for this argument, although a *Greek* copy of the *Phaedrus* was published in 1581, there was no *English* translation till 1701. The writer of the Plays, therefore, could read Greek, and such Greek as *Phaedrus*. If I am wrong, I would ask Mr. Lee, Where did Shakespeare get his reference to "Adonis' gardens?"

With regard to the marvellous knowledge of law throughout the dramas, Mr. Lee says:—"In view of his general quickness of apprehension, Shakespeare's accurate use of legal terms, which deserves all the attention that has been paid it, may be attributable in part to the many legal processes in which his father was involved, and in part to early intercourse with members of the Inns of Court."

Is Mr. Lee serious in his contention that an acquaintance with his father's "legal processes" and "intercourse" with a few barristers could give Shakespeare the knowledge of law displayed in the dramas? Has Mr. Lee ever met with a case of this kind, in which accurate legal knowledge has been picked up from social intercourse with lawyers? Lord Chief Justice Campbell said the author of the plays showed himself "to be very familiar with some of the most abstruse proceedings in English jurisprudence," and that in the *Comedy of Errors* "a deep technical knowledge of the law is displayed." And again, "He uniformly lays down good law." "While novelists and dramatists," he adds, "are constantly making mistakes as to the law of marriage, of wills and of inheritance, to Shakespeare's law, lavishly as he propounds it, there can be neither dimurrer, nor bill of exception, nor writ of error." Of Sonnet xlv. Lord Campbell says:—"I need not go farther than this Sonnet, which is so intensely legal in its language and imagery that without a considerable knowledge of English forensic procedure it cannot be fully understood."

Mr. Sidney Lee, Shakespearean scholar, is answered by Mr. Richard Grant White, Shakespearean scholar, to the following effect:—"As the Courts of Law in Shakespeare's time occupied public attention much more than they do now, it has been suggested that it was in attendance upon them that he picked up his legal vocabulary. But this supposition not only fails to account for Shakespeare's peculiar freedom and exactness in the use of that phraseology—it does not even place him in the way of learning those terms, his use of which is most remarkable, which are not such as he would have heard at ordinary proceedings at *nisi prius*, but such as refer to the tenure or transfer of real property—'fine and recovery,' 'statutes merchant,' 'purchase,' 'indenture,' 'tenure,' 'double voucher,' 'fee simple,' 'fee farm,' 'remainder,' 'reversion,' 'forfeiture,' etc." This conveyancer's jargon could not have been picked up by hanging around the Courts of Law in London 250 years ago, when suits as to the title to real property were comparatively so rare. And besides, Shakespeare uses his law just as freely in his early Plays, written in his first London years, as in those produced at a later period. Just as exactly, too; for the correctness and propriety with which these terms are introduced have compelled the admiration of a Chief Justice and a Lord Chancellor. Both Mr. Lee and Mr. White are agreed that Shakespeare was not a lawyer's clerk, the only point on which they appear to agree with regard to the legal lore found in the dramas.



Professor Newman once wrote:—"The late Judge, Lord Campbell, declares that no man can by genius know law; that Thackeray and Dickens often go wrong in law, but Shakespeare never."

In Mr. F. F. Heard's work, "Shakespeare a Lawyer," it is said: "Authors do not use technical terms in the familiar way in which Shakespeare speaks of the law, unless the terms really are familiar to them by frequent use; and we find these terms and allusions used by him in an apparently unconscious way as the natural turn of his thoughts."

Another Shakespearean, Mr. Appleton Morgan, declares: "Admitting William Shakespeare to have written that graveyard scene [in *Hamlet*], William Shakespeare was a practising lawyer."

What has Mr. Lee to say to these statements? Perhaps he agrees with Mr. Fiske, who wrote in the *Atlantic Monthly*, that "The author of *Hamlet* might easily have got all the knowledge [of law] involved from an evening chat with some legal friend at an ale-house." If that is where Shakespeare obtained his legal knowledge, it must have cost him some money, at any rate, and the less said about it the better.

On page 33 of this work, from which conjecture is almost entirely banished, the following passage occurs:—"Shakespeare's friends [at Stratford] may have called the attention of the strolling players [on a visit to Stratford] to the homeless lad, rumours of whose search for employment about the London theatres had doubtless reached Stratford. From such incidents seems to have sprung the opportunity which offered Shakespeare fame and fortune. . . . His intellectual capacity, and the amiability with which he turned to account his versatile powers were probably soon recognised, and thenceforth his promotion was assured." It is quite affecting—this lively interest Shakespeare's friends in Stratford must have taken in the "homeless lad," who, according to Sir Theodore Martin and Mrs. Stopes, fled from Stratford after his deer-stealing exploits with the MS. of *Venus and Adonis* "in his pocket," and held horses at the stage door! "There is no inherent improbability in the tale," says Mr. Lee. Can Shakespearean "faith" such as this find its parallel in any item of the Baconian creed?

On page 30 Mr. Lee declares that "the knowledge of a soldier's life which Shakespeare exhibited in his plays is no greater and no less than that which he displayed of almost all other spheres of human activity, and to assume that he wrote

of all or of any from practical experience, unless the evidence be conclusive, is to underrate his intuitive power of realising life under almost every aspect *by force of his imagination.*" This is the sum total of the Shakespearean argument—"intuitive power of realising life under almost every aspect by force of his imagination." This, we are asked to believe, enabled Shakespeare "to master" (according to Schlegel) "all the things and relations of this world." As Mr. Edwin Reed well says: "No man ever did, and, it is safe to say, no man ever can acquire knowledge intuitively. The fruit of the tree of knowledge can be reached only by hard climbing, the sole instance on record in which it was plucked and handed down to the waiting recipient having proved a failure." Bacon did the hard climbing; as he tells his uncle, "he had taken all knowledge for his province." There is no proof forthcoming that Shakespeare climbed the tree of knowledge. According to Mr. Lee, there was no necessity. He stood below with his mouth open, and the fruit dropped down *intuitively*. Lucky Shakespeare!

Mr. Lee then tells us: "It is, in fact, unlikely that Shakespeare ever set foot on the continent of Europe in either a private or professional capacity," and that it is "almost impossible that he could have gathered his knowledge of Northern Italy from personal observation. He doubtless owed all to the verbal reports of travelled friends or to books, the contents of which he had a rare power of assimilating and vitalising." We are not told what books, or where the books are. On this argument of Mr. Lee's, *The Athenæum*, so far back as 13th September, 1856, had the following remarks by the Editor:—"The most striking difficulty, perhaps, lies in the descriptions of foreign scenes, particularly of Italian scenes, and of sea-life, interwoven with the text of the Plays—descriptions so numerous and so marvellously accurate that it is almost impossible to believe they were written by a man who lived in London and Stratford, who never left this island, and who saw the world only from a strollers' booth. Every reader of the Plays has felt this difficulty, and theories have been formed of imaginary Shakespeare travels, in order to account for the minute local truth and the prevalence of local colour. It is not easy to conceive the *Merchant of Venice* as coming from the brain of one who had never strolled on the Rialto, or sunned himself on the slopes of Monte Bello."

Professor Elze also brings direct evidence to prove that the writer of the Plays had visited Mantua, and knew Italian

localities and home-life as no mere untravelled book-worm could, and Professor Hales agrees with Elze. But perhaps Shakespeare had access to some Elizabethan Baedekers or Murrays, unknown to Baconians.

With regard to Shakespeare's knowledge of Italian, Mr. Lee says:—"He doubtless possessed just sufficient acquaintance with Italian to enable him to discuss the drift of an Italian poem or novel," referring, as his authority, to Spencer Baynes' "What Shakespeare Learnt at School." He then acknowledges that the plot of the *Merchant of Venice* was taken from "Il Pecorone," and states that "the story followed by Shakespeare was not accessible in his day in any language but the original Italian," and again, "Several of the books in French and Italian, whence Shakespeare derived the plots of his dramas, were not accessible to him in any English translation," while on p. 236 we are informed that "Cinthio's painful story of Othello is not known to have been translated into English before Shakespeare dramatised. *He followed its main drift with fidelity.*" That the writer of the Plays had more than this smattering of Italian is proved by the fact that he must have read Vasari's *Lives of the Painters* in the original Italian. This is a fact of which Mr. Lee appears to be unaware.

In *A Winter's Tale* the statue of Hermione is called "a piece . . . now newly-performed by that rare Italian master, Julio Romano." Now this same Romano was known as a painter, not a sculptor. In the *first edition* of Vasari's *Lives of the Painters*, published in 1550, and never translated from its original Italian, we are informed that Romano did work in sculpture. In the *second edition*, published in 1568, and translated into several languages, this information is not given. Romano is there described as a painter. Either then the author of *A Winter's Tale* must have read the first edition of Vasari in the original Italian, or else he must have travelled in Italy and gazed upon statues by Romano. Of course, Mr. Lee will answer: Shakespeare owed his information to "the verbal reports of travelled friends," to which is also to be ascribed the knowledge of Venice, Padua, Verona, Mantua, and Milan, displayed in the dramas. What a host of convenient tutors William Shakespeare must have employed, providing his "intuitive power" with all its working material!

Then we are informed that "Shakespeare's accurate reference in *Macbeth* to the 'nimble' but 'sweet' climate of Inverness, and the vivid impression he conveys of the aspects of wild Highland heaths . . . can be satisfactorily accounted



for by his inevitable intercourse with Scotsmen in London and the theatres." Obliging Scotsmen! We wonder how many London Scotsmen of the period had ever been so far north as Inverness?

Again: "It was doubtless to Shakespeare's personal relations with men and women of the Court that his Sonnets owed their existence." From this we learn that Shakespeare, the actor and playwright, was the intimate friend of the nobility at the Court of Elizabeth and James. Yet Mr. Halliwell Phillips, "the soundest scholar among Shakespeare's biographers," according to Mr. Lee, tells us that "actors occupied an inferior position in society, and that even the vocation of a dramatic writer was considered scarcely respectable," and Dr. Ingleby has it that "at this day we can scarcely realise the scorn which was thrown on all sides upon those who made acting a means of livelihood. Let their lives be as clearly and their dealings as upright as they might, they were deemed to be *sans aveu*, runaways and vagrants." But, according to Mr. Lee, they were welcome guests at Court. Perhaps, it was also due to these same "personal relations with men and women of the Court" that we are to ascribe the aristocratic leanings of the author of the plays, who, we are told, fled from Stratford for killing an aristocrat's deer, and was first employed in holding aristocrats' horses at the door of the theatre! This strong aristocratic spirit is treated in an able fashion by Mr. Frank Harris, in a recent number of the *Saturday Review*, where he says: "Nor had the political philosophy then come into being which leads able men of our time to distrust all the ideas and beliefs which are current in the day and hour. No one in the sixteenth century sought for this reason to sever himself from the opinions and customs that obtained about him, and if a Bacon regarded the social peculiarities of his time as immutable and necessary laws, Shakespeare may be forgiven for not having followed this special science further than the famous lawyer and law-maker. Besides, Shakespeare's aristocratic leanings and his dislike of the vulgar must have been intensified by the every day incidents of his trade. . . . Naturally enough, Shakespeare came to detest the middle classes, even more than he detested the commons. . . . It is no wonder that Shakespeare makes his 'citizens' contemptible. But nothing in his time and in his calling, nothing, in fact, but imperious bent of nature, can explain that love of aristocracy which betrays itself in all his works. . . . There can be no denying that the bias of Shake-

spere in favour of the aristocrat narrowed his vision of life." How did Shakespeare come to despise the class to which he himself belonged? Bacon's "aristocratic leanings" are well known. In fact, Dean Church, says:—"Bacon had no sympathy with popular wants and claims; of popularity and all that was called popular, he had the deepest suspicion and dislike." This is the spirit everywhere displayed in the Shakespearean dramas, where we are ever meeting with such expressions as the "mob," the "unmasked rabble," the "swinish rabble," &c.

It is also worthy of note that in his appendix Mr. Lee acknowledges that "of the sixteen plays of his (Shakespeare's) that were published in his life-time, not one was printed with his sanction. He made no audible protest when seven contemptible dramas in which he had no hand were published with his name or initials on the title-page, while his fame was at its height." How does Mr. Lee explain what he calls this "utter indifference to all questions touching the publication of his works?" May I suggest the natural answer—Because, though he produced the plays, he was not their author, and was therefore unable to inhibit their publication? Well may the Right Hon. D. H. Madden, in his "*Diary of Master William Silence*" ("his entertaining and scholarly *Diary*," according to Mr. Lee), launch out on this point to the following effect:—"That notwithstanding the publication and rapid sale of pirated and inaccurate copies, he was never moved, during the years of retirement at Stratford, to take even the initial step of collecting and revising for publication the manuscripts of his Plays; and that, so far as their author was concerned, they might be stolen, travestied, or perish altogether, are surely among the strangest facts in the history of literature," and this is the confession of as ardent a Shakespearean as Mr. Sidney Lee. The appearance, therefore, of Shakespeare's name or initials on the title-pages of the quartos is no proof that Shakespeare was their author. The laxity in the claiming of the authorship of Plays in the Elizabethan age is well described by Mr. Greenstreet in an article read to the Browning Society in 1888, entitled, "*The Whitefriars Theatre in the time of Shakespeare*," where it is stated:—"At a date when Plays were seldom if ever printed at the outset, the authorship of a large majority of them belonged to well nigh any one who chose to make the claim. For, when stage plays were first introduced, few of the performers themselves possessed the needed qualifications for the

production of dramatic works. And we may safely infer, I think, that most of the early Plays were the outcome of the industry of men of learning and travel, and the best read and more worldly experienced of the nobility. What were their names, Mr. Greenstreet? Did they write anonymously or under pseudonyms?" Perhaps Mr. Lee can inform me.

In his Appendix Mr. Lee starts the section dealing with "the sources of biographical knowledge" with the statement that "the scantiness of contemporary records of Shakespeare's career has been much exaggerated," while in his Preface he says, "I have endeavoured to set before my readers a plain and practical narrative of the great dramatist's *personal history*." Well, the first Appendix, to which we allude, excepting so far as parish registers and such impersonal documents are concerned, does not refer to a *single contemporaneous authority* about William Shakespeare himself. Such a keen critic as Mr. Lee might be expected to know that such writers as Collier, Halliwell-Phillipps, Fleay, Wheeler, Wise, Farmer, &c., are not in any true sense "sources of biographical knowledge." They are only privates in the vast army of guessers, or at best, Shakesperean critics. How little of the personal history of William Shakespeare is related by his contemporaries is shown by Mr. Lee's acknowledgment on page 265 that "*the sole anecdote of Shakespeare that is positively known to have been recorded in his lifetime* relates that Burbage, when playing Richard III., agreed with a lady in the audience to visit her after the performance; Shakespeare, overhearing the conversation, anticipated the actor's visit, and met Burbage on his arrival with the quip that 'William the Conqueror was before Richard the Third.'" This, it must be acknowledged, is a slightly different piece of *personal history* from that which Mr. Lee records of William Shakespeare in his book on *Stratford-on-Avon*, where it is writ:—"Shakespeare, it should also be remembered, must have been a regular attendant at the Parish Church, and may at times have enjoyed a sermon." It is history such as this that forms the larger part of every *Life of Shakespeare*.

In regard to the latest—that of Mr. Sidney Lee—there is scarcely a page which is not more or less unsound, because of the *πρώτον ψεύδος*, or *petitio principii*, of the Shakespeare myth, besides that the buttresses in support of this huge phantom encumber the whole subject, necessitating the introduction of an infinite quantity of absolutely useless stuff.



## A ROSICRUCIAN DOCUMENT CONNECTED WITH SIR FRANCIS BACON.

**T**RAJANO BOCCALINI was the son of an *architect* (mason), an Italian by birth, and flourished in the latter part of the 16th century. He is known chiefly as a satirist, and the Author of "*Ragguagli di Parnasso*." The exact date of the publication of this work is unknown, but it was certainly published before his death, which occurred in 1613. The book is divided into 123 "Advertisements," the 78th of which appears as one of the manifestoes of the Rosicrucian fraternity. In 1704 it appeared newly done into English, and adapted to the present times, by N. N., Esqre. (Nicolas Nicolai), with a recommendation on the title-page, by Roger L'Estrange, "This revised version being curious, I reproduce it."

The argument of the 78th Advertisement is briefly this: "By order from Apollo a general Reformation of the world is to be published by the Seven Wise Men of Greece, and some other Literati." Apollo finding hardly any, even of the Virtuosi in Parnassus, fit to reform their companions, he at last fixes upon the Seven Wise Men of Greece; in addition to these he selects Marcus Cato and Annæus Seneca, and in honour of the English philosophers he makes Sir Francis Bacon Secretary of the Society, and honours him with a vote in the assembly.

Thales, of Miletus, first speaks, assuring the rest that he has found an antidote against the corruptions which he believes to be nothing else than dissembled hatred, feigned love, double dealing, &c. The cure is to be making a little window in men's breasts,\* whereby all this hypocrisy and secret contrivance being openly exposed to the rest of mankind, they must necessarily learn, not only to *seem*, but to *be* honest and virtuous. The opinion of Thales was much applauded, but it had to be, nevertheless, discarded for anatomical reasons.

Solon then proceeded to charge the inequality of Wealth in the age as the cause of corruption, and his proposed remedy was to divide the world anew, giving every man an equal share in it. And to the end that this equality should endure, all sorts of traffic should be for ever prohibited. This suggestion was, after a long debate, disposed of, as it was thought that too much fortune would fall to fools.† Chilo,

\* "Behold the window of my heart," &c.—*L. L. L.* v. 2.

† "Call me not fool till Heaven hath sent me fortune."—*As You Like It* v. 7

therefore, stood up and argued that the greed of gold and silver was the root of all evil, and that if these metals were banished corruption would disappear.

Cleobulus refuted these opinions, and hotly maintained that the metal most prejudicial to the world is iron, which being designed by Nature for the making of plough-shares, spades, and mattocks, had, by men's malice, been forged into instruments for the destruction of mankind. But though the opinion of Cleobulus was thought to be good, yet the assembly found it impossible that iron should be expelled except by iron, which would be but to multiply mischiefs, and to cure one wound by making many more.

Pittachus declared that all would be well if men could be forced to walk by the way of virtue, and that by this way only they should be allowed to follow the laboursome journey which leads to supreme dignities. This opinion was admired by the assembly until Periander changed their minds by saying that undue advancement, and the favour of kings, was attributable to the fact that deserving men instead of courting the goodwill of the prince waited to be courted, and that if the men advanced were learned and faithful as well as deserving corruptions would cease. Now, "undeserving dwarfs became great giants in a month's time, ignorance is seated in the chair of knowledge and partiality in the tribunal of justice."

Bias then gave as his opinion that the present disorder arose from the want of due observance of the laws of Nature, avarice and ambition having caused men to break down the natural boundaries between countries and seas, men boring through mountains, passing the most rapid rivers, and crossing the seas in ships. In order to prevent the confusion arising from such rash boldness, Bias recommends the breaking down of all bridges, the destruction of mountain roads and passes, and the absolute prohibition of all kinds of navigation. This proposition was also carefully examined, but discarded as impracticable; and further discussion by Cleobulus, Thales, and Periander followed with no better results.

Cato then alarmed and displeased the assembly by desiring them to pray for a second Deluge to destroy all males over twelve years of age; and that all females, both young and old, should be exterminated, for "as long as there shall be any women in the world, men will be wicked." For when a man's house is so crazy, the walls so gape that it cannot

stand long, were it not better to pluck it down and build a new one than perpetually be patching up an old one. On the rejection of this last suggestion the assembly had only one more string to their bow, their Secretary, Sir Francis Bacon, who, not discouraged by the ill success of his seniors, spoke to the following effect:—

“You seem to me, gentlemen, to throw away your time in consultations, like foolish physicians ere you have seen the sick party or heard an account of her illness from herself. . . . ’Tis therefore my advice that the present age be immediately brought before us, that we may feel her pulse, and ask her what questions we shall think convenient about her illness, &c. Then I dare undertake we shall find the cure easy, which you now think desperate.”\*

“The whole assembly were so well pleased with Sir Francis Bacon’s opinions” that they carried out his suggestion. The age was brought before them, but her horrible sores and corruptions were found to be so deeply sunk into her blood and marrow that there was not one sound part about her. They therefore dismissed her as being past hope of cure.

There are some points of notice in this edition, “done into English by N. N., Esq.,” and published in 1704, probably about 100 years after the publication of the Italian version (called the original) by Boccalini, and 90 years after the anonymous German edition of 1614. This English “translation” (attributed, like the English version of “Montaigne’s Essays” to an Italian) contains, for the first time, the name of *Sir Francis Bacon*. “Mazzoni, a novice,” is the Secretary to the assembly of learned men in Boccalini’s version. So here, as in many other cases, we find apparently two versions—one intended for the general public, the other for the initiated few, or “for the future ages, when some time shall have gone over.” In the first Bacon is concealed, in the second (when interest in or excitement concerning the Rosicrucian fraternity had passed away with all, excepting the traditional Sons of Science, the Invisible Brotherhood, or the Literary and Religious High Freemasons), then the fictitious name is exchanged for the true, and Francis Bacon himself steps forth. Can we doubt that this “translation” is the original? It is full of Baconisms, *Promus* Notes of 1593, “Fixed Ideas,” and modes of expression of Francis Bacon.

\* “Diseases desperate grown  
By desperate appliance are relieved.”—*Ham.* iv. 3.



Note that here the age is *she*. Boccacini also speaks of "the foul infirmities under which *she* labours," but then "it" is sent for, "that we may interrogate *it* of *its* sickness," and the age being brought in a chair, "*he* was a man of full years, . . . *he* seemed likely to live yet many ages, only *he* was short-breathed, his voice very weak," &c., and so the age continues *he* to the end of the chapter.

It would be well if the various editions of this notable Rosicrucian document were collated and published; at least the oft-reiterated assertion, that there is no connection between *Bacon* and the *Rosicrucian* fraternity would be laid to rest.

L. BIDDULPH.

## A BRIEF CONTROVERSY.

FEW members of the Bacon Society are likely to have heard of a little controversy on the Bacon-Shakespeare question which has been going on in *The Stratford-on-Avon Herald*. The correspondence began on Oct. 7th, 1898, and was continued until March 24th, 1899. At this date, when (as Baconians will think) Mr. Stronach and Mr. Henry Dryerre were manifestly gaining the upper hand in every argument, and many fresh champions armed cap-a-pie had entered the lists, they were met with the editorial notice at the end of Mr. Stronach's letter, "This closes the correspondence." Many of us regretted this circumstance, whilst still highly applauding the moral courage and public spirit of a newspaper editor who could at this day, and from such a locality admit an answer to a "Shakesperean" article. Anyone curious in the matter can see the whole correspondence, by applying (with satisfactory references to some Member or Associate) to the Hon. Sec. of this Society, who will forward a mounted collection of the cuttings. We would gladly reprint some of the letters in which, point by point, the *Shakesperean* objections have been met, and erroneous statements corrected, but want of space does not admit of return to arguments and fallacies as often disproved as stated.

It may, however, be of some interest to beginners, if we attempt to recapitulate the chief heads under which the assumptions and conclusions (we dare not say the *arguments* or *chain of reasoning*) of our opponents seem to range themselves; for these are seen to be typical, and fair examples of

the style and manner in which all similar discussions upon the Bacon-Shakespeare question are conducted by the defendants.

1. There is first the assumption that because certain students are deeply read in "*Bacon*," therefore they must be ignorant of "*Shakespeare*." This ignorance is supposed to increase in direct proportion to the study of Baconian works.

2. That any writer should arrive at conclusions based upon this equal study of both groups of works, is held to be a sign of ignorance, absurdity, incapacity for taking common-sense views of any question, sufficient to justify those who have not thus thought or studied, in terming the Bacon-Shakespeare scholars, fools, impostors, cranks, and other names familiar to modern Shakespearean literature.

3. On the other hand it is found (by some process of reasoning which we have not mastered) to be unnecessary for a "Shakespearean" critic to have more than the most superficial acquaintance with the works of "*Bacon*," in order to be qualified to pronounce decided opinions upon all matters connected with the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy.

4. Where any argument cuts both ways, or where evidence tells as well on the one side as on the other, it is to be held good only when in favour of "*Shakespeare*."

5. Should some anonymous journalist or professional writer have criticised adversely, imperfectly, or unfairly some Baconian book or article, such book or article is to be considered as "demolished," even though replies on the Baconian side are refused, and "the correspondence closed."

6 (and this is important). Shakespearean champions, as a rule, practically wave away, or beg the whole question :—"Did the man whom we know as "Francis Bacon" write the works now known as "*Shakespeare*," together with "a mass of other unacknowledged works, published under other names?" To put it more briefly :—Was "*Shakespeare*"\* a mere pseudonym adopted under stress of circumstances?

7. No observant reader can overlook the tendency of thorough-paced "Shakespereans" to confuse *assumptions* with *facts*—to write perpetually of the supposed poet, in the conjunctive mood. According to them, "Shakespeare" the

\* This spelling of the family name Shakspur, Shakspurre, Shaxper, &c., show that the ordinary pronunciation was not adopted by any member of the family, on tombs, or in deeds, &c., until about 20 years after the supposed poet's death. In the six volumes of Registers, Annals, Accounts, &c., of the Theatrical Managers' and the Stationers' Company, published by the *first* Shakespeare Society are only two marginal notes in which this name is in any way introduced ; in both cases it is spelt "Shaxberd."

man "may," "might," "could," "would," have done, or "possibly" or "probably" did an infinite number of interesting things. Yet there is no iota of proof that Will Shakspeare, of Stratford-on-Avon, ever did, could do, or wished to have a hand in any such matters. We know a good deal about him, and cannot find any single good, noble, generous or worthy record of the Stratford hero.

8. We ask thoughtful readers to take a "*Shakespearean*" life, biography, or personal history from the careful records of Halliwell Phillips to the equally painstaking and more readable work of Mr. Sidney Lee, recently published. Let the reader underline in red ink every phrase or paragraph which argues by assumptions and totally unproved suppositions. Let him similarly underline all the "proofs" from internal evidence (usually found far more applicable to "Bacon" than to Shakspeare). Now let it be seen how much remains of the fancied proofs as to authorship. The supposed poet and his imaginary history will fade, and leave scarce a wrack behind.

Such slight encounters in the field of argument, trivial as they may appear to some of us, might still be turned to good use, for much still remains to be known. We Baconians readily admit our lack of information upon many perplexing matters, and, in so far as these concern "*Shakespeare*" only, we might both give and receive help by a more frequent interchange of questions and answers. One of the Stratford correspondents, "a late Librarian of the Shakespeare Memorial," says: "I am heartily tired of the folly and ignorance displayed by the Baconians." This is crushing; but since this gentleman is so conscious of our shortcomings and want of proper teaching, would it not be a kindly act if he would help our infirmities and supply our needs? We do not ask for help beyond the pale of matters purely "*Shakespearean*," but we should be grateful for direct information upon several points, of which the following are a few:—

(1) Where is the *proof* (not mere presumptive evidence) that William Shakspeare could write without copying, tracing, or having his hand guided?

(2) Where is any proof that Shakspeare possessed a book, even a Bible, or that he could read?

(3) What proof is there that he ever went to school?

(4) What proof as to who were the designers, makers, and erectors of the monumental tablet to Shakspeare in the church at Stratford-on-Avon? They must have been strangely ill-



acquainted with their business when they affirmed upon that monument that within it was "plast" the body of the poet, knowing, as we are all supposed to know, that William Shakspeare was buried deep down in a grave some feet from the wall to which the monumental tablet is affixed.

(5) Why did the Registers of the Stationers' Company, the Accounts of the Revels at Court, the Theatrical Accounts of Edward Alleyne, the Memoirs of Edward Alleyne, and Henslowe's Diary (all published by the first *Shakespeare Society*) utterly ignore the man or the name Shakespeare. Two entries of the performance on Shrove Sunday and Shrove Tuesday of the *Merchant of Venice* have in the margin (as name of the poet) "Shaxberd" (see account of the "*Revels at Court*," pp. 204-5). So far as William Shakspeare is concerned, "the rest is silence." How comes it that no records of money paid to the author or his representatives are extant—at least, *before the public*?

(6) We would also be grateful for explicit information about the history of the oil-painting of *Shakespeare* preserved as "the most precious gem of the collection" at the Shakespeare Cottage. Very different tales have been told concerning this modern-looking picture to different inquiring visitors. The story that it was found in the house of Dr. Hall, disguised by a dark beard which was removed by a picture-cleaner, seems too strange to be true. Still stranger is the explanation of this disguise. Susanna, the eldest daughter of Shakspeare, married Dr. Hall, and as this marriage raised her in the social scale, she was ashamed to exhibit in her own home the clean-shaven portrait of her father, *the actor*.

(7) The question of this portrait raises another with which, for the present, we will conclude. Ignorant Baconians are most anxious to know why the "Kesselstadt" mask has of late years been made in photographic pictures sold at Stratford-on-Avon, to do duty and be foisted upon the public as the "*Death Mask of Shakespeare*?" The whole story of that "Darmstadt" or "Kesselstadt" mask has been so often told that we do not repeat it here.\* The main point which at present concerns us is that the cast of the *Shakespeare* effigy on the monument, which was formerly considered as authentic, and perhaps modelled from a death-mask, has now been superseded by a mask which belongs to an artist's family in Germany, and which bears no resemblance to the effigy, but a

\* See a Paper read before the Bacon Society, BACONIANA, May, 1893, pp. 19-20.

very strong resemblance to portraits, busts, and medallions of Francis "Bacon." The Kesselstadt mask was in 1860 offered as "*Shakespeare*" to the authorities at the British Museum. After one and a-half years' deliberation, that mask was rejected as "Shakespeare," and returned to Germany. Now Stratford-on-Avon has adopted this rejected cast. We ask, On what grounds have Shakespeareans adopted it?

If Shakespeareans will take in good part these queries, and will answer them, we shall be happy to supply answers to any questions or difficulties which they in turn may raise, and which, in the opinion of Baconians, may be capable of satisfactory and straightforward explanation.

## NOTES.

DR. APPLETON MORGAN has noted the fact that a small type called *nonpareil* was introduced in English printing-houses from Holland about the year 1560, and became preferred beyond the others in common use. He adds:—"It seems to have become a favourite with Shakespeare, who calls many of his lady characters *nonpareils*."

Mr. Wigston has pointed out that "in the Play of *The Tempest* we have a magical, superhuman presentation of the poet."

Now, the poet's *works* also appear to be hinted at in the character of Miranda, as follows:—

*Tempest* iii. 3:—

Caliban: "And that most deeply to consider is  
The beauty of his daughter; he himself  
Calls her a *nonpareil*."

\* \* \*

In Sonnet No. 38 (which, as Mr. Wigston has clearly shown, is addressed to the Sun or Light) we have:—

"Be thou the *tenth Muse*, ten times more in worth,  
Than those old nine which rhymers invoke."

It is curious to note that in the "Manes Verulamini" Bacon himself is apostrophised as the *tenth Muse*.

\* \* \*

## A PARALLEL.

*Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Act I, Scene i. (line 66):—

Proteus. . . . "Thou hast *metamorphosed* me."



Bacon's "Natural History," Experiment 99. . . . "This *Proteus* of matter being held by the sleeves, will turn and change into many *metamorphoses*."

Qy. Is not the figure on the top of the symbolic design of the Bacon Medal (see BACONIANA, Vol. i., p. 173) identical with the upper part of the figure described in Mr. Wigston's "Bacon, Shakespeare, and the Rosicrucians" as "Hermes Mercurius Trismegistus, Nature, Virgin of the World, or Rosalind?"

#### TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

SIRS,—One of the first questions which arises in the mind of an inquirer when considering the claims made on behalf of Francis Bacon for the authorship of the "Shake-speare" Plays is:—Why, if he wrote them, did he neglect to acknowledge them? Many reasons have been suggested to account for his omission to do so, which, though they be plausible enough and may or may not have influenced him in his resolve, appear to me to be far from the mark as regards the principal motive which actuated him.

I submit that his chief reason was purely an *artistic* one. He felt that in order to preserve at all costs an absolute distinction between the types of character of his various *dramatis personæ*, who should stand forth as if (so to speak) self-created, it was in the highest degree necessary that no connection (such as an acknowledgment of authorship would bring about) should be felt between the minds of the characters and the mind of their creator, otherwise (however marvellously portrayed) they could not but suffer by being divested of a certain indefinable essence of reality and become, in some measure, invested with the individuality of the author.

It is difficult to conceive at the first blush that any man, however much he might love the children of his brain, would, for the greater glory of the works themselves, forego indefinitely, and perhaps for ever, all the personal honour and fame to be derived from an acknowledgment of their authorship; and yet in this sacrifice we see the broad mind of the great master, whilst we feel that his recognition of the *artistic necessity* for the sacrifice evidences the force of his unique genius.

E. V. TANNER.

#### TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

SIRS,—In 1598, John Marston published a thin volume, entitled, "The Metamorphosis of Pigmaliions Image and certaine Satyres." The first Satyre is evidently meant for Shakespeare, and is important to Baconians, for it contains hints that the reputed author was not the writer of the works ascribed to him, but someone else. A few quotations will be of interest:—

"I cannot show in strange proportion,  
Changing my hew like a camelion;  
But you all-canning wits, hold water out,  
Yee vizarded-bifronted-Janian rout.



Tell mee, browne Ruscus, hast thou Gyges ring,  
That thou presum'st as if thou wert unseene?"

"For shame! unmaske; leave for to cloke intent,  
And show thou art vaine-glorious impudent."

"He, who on his glorious scutchion,  
Can quaintly show wits newe invention."

"Tut, he is famous for his reveling,  
For fine sette speeches, and for sonetting;  
He scornes the violl, and the scraping sticke,  
And yet's but broker of another's wit.  
Certes, if all things were well-known and view'd,  
He doth but champe that which another chew'd."

It will be noted that Robert Greene's somewhat similar attack was written in 1592 (six years earlier). Addressing his fellow dramatists he bids them beware of puppets "that speak from our mouths" and of "antics garnished in our colours." . . . "Never more acquaint [these pretenders] with your admired inventions, for it is pity men of such rare wits should be subject to the pleasures of such rude groomes."

The heading of Satyre I. is also curious. It is "Quedam videntur, et non sunt,"—those who are seen and are not. The heading of Satyre II. is "Quedam sunt et non videntur,"—those who are, and are not seen.

F. J. BURGoyNE.

ERRATAS in article in January number of BACONIANA entitled "*The Quarterly Review*:"—

Page 1, 6th line from foot, for "confirmation" read "confutation."

Page 3, 3rd line from foot, for CEAENH read EAENH.

Page 4, the paragraph beginning "The reviewer" should appear on page 4, after the paragraph ending "accordingly."

Page 11, 15th line from top, for "fits" read "pity."

Page 11, 9th line from foot, for "Waverly" read "Waverley."